

**Towards Broader Adoption of Educational Innovations in Undergraduate Water
Resources Engineering: Views from Academia and Industry**

Emad Habib¹ and Matthew Deshotel²

¹Department of Civil Engineering & Louisiana Watershed Flood Center, Institute for Coastal and
Water Research, University of Louisiana at Lafayette, Lafayette, P.O. Box 70503, USA

²Department of Civil Engineering, University of Louisiana at Lafayette, Lafayette, P.O. Box
70503, USA.

Correspondence Author: Emad Habib (habib@louisiana.edu)

Abstract

This article investigates the challenges that face the development, community-scale adoption, and long-term sustainability of educational innovations in the field of hydrology and water resources engineering undergraduate education. Adopting a customer-based discovery process, the current study conducted a set of 78 informal interviews with two main groups: faculty members who teach water resources and hydrology courses, and practicing engineers with specialty in the same field. The interviews revealed that the main motivation for faculty to develop or adopt new educational innovations stems from self-efficacy and desire to achieve effective instructional strategies. Other factors, such as institutional requirements and faculty evaluations and incentives, seem to play a modulating role for generating self-created motivation. The results identified time limitations and steep learning-curves as the two adoption hindering factors cited by a majority of the interviewees. Other hindering factors reported were rigidity of resources and lack of assessment data. Industry perspectives on preparedness of recent graduates and relation to current educational practices showed that young engineers may lack critical skills on the proper use and interpretation of data and modeling analyses. The study also discusses potential solutions, such as development of sharing environments to facilitate exchange of data and resources, modular design to support adaptation and compatibility with existing curricula, collaborative efforts to produce shareable evaluation and assessment data, and potential opportunities for collaboration between academia and the professional industry to facilitate development and sustainability of educational innovations.

Keywords: Water resources; Education; Innovations; Adoption; Interviews; Academia; Industry

Introduction

Recent reviews of the literature emphasize the need for formalized approaches to reform hydrology and water resources engineering education (McIntosh and Taylor 2013; Seibert et al. 2013; Ruddell and Wagener 2014). These desired reforms call for tapping into discipline-based advances in data, modeling, and information systems; exposure to modern tools used in engineering practices; adoption of sound educational strategies such as active-learning; and use of real-world case studies to deliver authentic learning experiences. Examples of recent educational developments that strive to introduce pedagogical changes in hydrology and water resources engineering education include development of web-based learning modules (Habib et al. 2012a; Yigzaw et al. 2013), computer models, and simulation games (Hoekstra 2012; Merwade and Ruddel 2012; Rusca et al. 2012; Seibert and Vis 2012; AghaKouchak et al. 2013; Sanchez et al. 2016), sharing of educational materials via community platforms (Wagener et al. 2012), use of hydrology real-world case studies (Wagener and Zappe 2008), use of geospatial and visualization technologies (Habib et al. 2012b), and the use of real-time environmental monitoring to enhance student engagement (McDonald et al. 2015; Brogan et al. 2016). However, these efforts face challenges in achieving scalability, sustainability, and community-scale adoption (Ruddell and Wagener 2014). This recurring problem has been a major concern for the institutional and financial investments by the STEM education community (McKenna et al. 2011; Singer et al. 2012). Barriers to scalability and adoption have been attributed to various issues such as characteristics of the innovation, faculty perceptions, student resistance, and institutional cultures and resources (Hardgrave et al. 2003; Rogers 2003; Heywood 2006). Rogers's (2003) theory on diffusion of innovation, considered one of the most relevant theoretical perspectives that can guide engineering education innovations (Borrego et al. 2010),

identifies five innovation characteristics that influence adoption: relative advantage, compatibility, complexity, trialability, and observability. The ease of implementation and ease of use were also cited by Compeau et al. (2007) and Bourrie et al. (2014) as important factors. A survey of U.S. engineering departments (Borrego et al. 2010) identified several faculty issues that affect adoption of engineering education innovations, including faculty time for preparation and management of labor-intensive innovations, faculty resistance to change, and skepticism regarding evidence of improved student learning. While these factors apply across the general field of engineering education, there is a need to identify discipline-specific factors that may hinder or facilitate adoption of innovations. As suggested by Borrego et al. (2016), the value of a certain innovation varies according to the specific engineering discipline, simply due to the specific technical skills and educational content pertaining to the discipline. This is also supported by earlier studies on behavioral prediction and behavior change (e.g., Theory of Planned Behavior, Ajzen 2018) that link an individual's behavioral intentions and actual behaviors to subjective norms and perceived behavioral control. The likelihood of adoption increases among peers of the same discipline as they share their own developments and communicate experiences in using and deploying the new innovations. Therefore, research on innovation adoption and diffusion has been recommended at the discipline and sub-discipline scales as a strategy for understanding the effectiveness of engineering and science education initiatives and their adoption potential (Henderson et al. 2012; Finelli et al. 2014; Khatri et al. 2016). Examples of pioneering efforts focused on specific engineering disciplines are found in the fields of chemical engineering (e.g., Prince et al. 2013) and electrical and computer engineering (Froyd et al. 2013; Shekhar and Borrego 2016). Other studies offered cross-field comparative assessments (e.g., Cutler et al. 2012). Each engineering discipline has its own social

system that controls the culture of adopting new educational innovations (Lattuca and Stark 1995; Wankat et al. 2002), and hydrology and water resources engineering is not an exception in this regard.

The current study reports results collected from a set of 78 informal, open-response qualitative interviews with hydrology and water resources faculty and engineering professionals. The study provides a customer-driven perspective on the propagation, scaling, and adoption of education innovations in the field of hydrology and water resources engineering. The term customer (or user as we refer to it later in the article) refers to the typical user of educational developments (e.g., faculty members teaching hydrology). The results provide insights on the needs, motivations, and hindering factors that affect engineering faculty as developers and potential adopters of educational innovations in this field. Such insights can be used to inform ongoing and future development and management of water resources engineering education innovations and avoid the undesirable paths of lack of adoption and long-term sustainability.

Methodology

Customer-Discovery Approach

The interviews discussed in this study were conducted by the authors as part of their participation in a customer-discovery program known as the Innovation Corps for Learning (I-Corps L) (Chavela Guerra et al. 2014; Smith et al. 2016). The I-Corps L program uses an entrepreneurial approach for business model generation and validation that was proposed earlier in the lean startup movement (e.g., Osterwalder and Pigneur 2010; Blank and Dorf 2012) and social entrepreneurship (e.g., Janus 2018). The main rationale behind this approach is that before expending a significant amount of resources on an innovation, the developer should first confirm that it addresses a specific problem or need of potential customers (or users, in the more general

sense). The only way to test the viability of the innovation prior to investing exorbitant amounts of time and money is to get out of the building and talk to potential customers, identify their needs and existing problems, and how they currently manage such problems. Once the needs of users are identified and verified, the next steps in the I-Corps L process (not covered in this paper) focus on formulating a value proposition and looking for a business model on how to further pursue the proposed innovations, including market size and cost and revenue structures.

Adopting this approach, the authors conducted a total of 100 interviews with potential users of educational developments in the area of hydrology and water resources engineering. The study reports on only 78 interviews that were conducted with members from academia and industry. The 22 remaining interviews were deemed uninformative (e.g., interviewees didn't teach undergraduate courses, didn't teach relevant courses, or didn't provide relevant inputs) and as such were excluded from our analysis. The interviews were designed with a customer-centered approach (i.e., focusing on what a user needs from an educational innovation), rather than a developer-centered mindset (i.e., focusing on a specific product or innovation). Using an informal, open-ended interview design (Patton 1990), the interview questions were fairly short and not overly specific, allowing the interviewee to be the center of the conversation. Interviews were conducted either in person, over the phone, or via a teleconferencing venue, and ranged from 30 to 60 minutes. The range of people interviewed in the current study was quite broad in order to capture the hydrology education landscape from as many different points of view as possible. Generally, the interviews were divided into two main categories: academia and industry. The following are brief summaries of each category, including distinction of user segments within each group and what was asked during the interviews.

124 **Interviews with Academia**

125 Academia, in the context of this paper, refers to interviewees associated with post-secondary
126 hydrology and water resources education in civil engineering and geoscience programs. A total
127 of 42 interviews were conducted with instructors from different types of educational institutions
128 including research- and instructional-intensive, and small and large four-year universities. The
129 majority of interviewees were from institutions with medium to intensive research focus, while
130 just eight were from instructional-focused institutions. Three-quarters of the institutions were
131 mid to large-size programs, with the remaining one-quarter considered small in size. These
132 institutions were spread across the United States, covering 22 states, and included faculty with
133 different specializations within the overall domain of water resources and hydrology. The
134 interviewees were about two thirds from civil engineering departments and the rest were from
135 earth sciences. The authors recognize the differences between hydrology as an earth-science, and
136 water resources engineering as an applied field, and the implications of such differences from an
137 educational perspective. However, due to the significant overlap between the two fields and how
138 they are actually taught in both engineering and science departments, a decision was made to not
139 explicitly differentiate between them in designing the interviews and in selecting the potential
140 faculty interviewees.

141 The main interview questions with academia are summarized as follows:

- 142 i. What type of pedagogies are currently being used in the classroom? Is there a need to
143 reform the undergraduate hydrology and water resources curriculum?
- 144 ii. Do instructors currently use emerging technologies in the undergraduate classroom? If so,
145 in what way, and if not, why not?

- 146 iii. Do instructors look for innovative educational material to use in their classroom? If so,
147 where do they look?
- 148 iv. What are the issues with teaching engineering-industry tools and techniques in the
149 classroom? What are the challenges of developing material that encompasses these tools?
- 150 v. What is the incentive for instructors to improve their teaching methods using innovative
151 contents and new resources?

152 **Interviews with Industry**

153 Industry needs skilled graduates who are capable of applying hydrologic concepts taught in the
154 classroom to practical real-world engineering problems (DiNatale 2008; Eisel 2008). In today's
155 technology-driven society, and with the recent advancements in data and hydro-informatics, this
156 often requires a deep knowledge of a number of computer applications, data processing tools,
157 and simulation models. Thus, interviewing engineering professionals from industry was
158 important for two main reasons. The first was for an assessment of the preparedness of
159 graduating students to perform on the job, and how this can be traced back to strengths and
160 weaknesses from an undergraduate education perspective. Secondly, it was of interest to discover
161 what type of post-graduation training professionals find necessary, how it is provided, and
162 whether opportunities exist for academia-industry collaborations in addressing undergraduate
163 educational reforms. A total of 36 interviews were conducted with practicing engineers. To
164 capture the full spectrum of industry, both private (consulting firms) and public sectors (state and
165 federal water resources agencies) were considered, along with a good mix in the size (small,
166 medium, and large) of organizations. The breakdown of the interviewees included a mix of
167 junior engineers and senior engineers or managers, with somewhat more from the latter group.
168 The junior engineers were fresh out of school and could provide insight into the transition from

an undergraduate setting to the workplace from a first-person point of view. Senior engineers provided a third-person perspective on the transition of recent graduates to the workplace, giving insight on the evolution of the young engineers. The managerial perspective, of course, provides logistical information associated with the training and professional development of engineers.

The main interview questions for industry professionals are summarized as follows:

- i. What is the level of preparedness of graduating water resources engineers as they enter their first job and progress in their career?
- ii. Are there any certain gaps in basic knowledge and applied skills that should be addressed at the undergraduate level?
- iii. What are the current post-graduation training and professional development strategies?
- iv. Are there any opportunities for universities to use advances from the professional field and enhance undergraduate education?

Results

Views from Academia

A total of 42 interviews were conducted with university professors teaching water resources and hydrology related courses. During these interviews, the authors first tried to decipher the motivation underlying the desire to enhance the undergraduate hydrology and water resources engineering education, then discussed challenges associated with developing, discovering, and utilizing innovative resources and materials.

Motivators: What motivates instructors to incorporate innovative teaching materials?

The faculty interviewees expressed a need for improving education in the fields of hydrology and water resources engineering. The majority of the interviews indicated that the main source of

191 motivation to improve course content and teaching strategies is self-created and derives from
192 one's desire to excel at endeavors associated with his or her career. Achievement, self-esteem,
193 and self-efficacy play a large role in this. However, based on interviewees' statements, this
194 source of motivation is modulated and affected by institutional and faculty factors. The
195 interviewees indicated that incentives such as program accreditation, performance reviews, and
196 pressure from superiors (deans/department heads) are not the predominant factors. Instead,
197 factors related to instructor's experience (i.e., junior or experienced) and instructor's priorities
198 (i.e., research or teaching) were highlighted by some of the interviewees to possibly influence the
199 tendency to participate in innovative instructional strategies.

200 Junior instructors tend to be very ambitious and are likely to strive to bring something new to
201 their classrooms. Additionally, they are more accustomed to quickly adjusting their ways to take
202 advantage of new advancements. Often, they are in the process of developing their courses and
203 want to do so in a way that is most effective and well informed by recent educational research. In
204 contrast, the experienced instructors who have been teaching for many years already have a
205 working curriculum that has been developed, utilized, and proven. This reluctance to change is
206 logical and well-understood, and is often hard to argue with, especially given the lack of tangible
207 incentives. The argument is, however, that the teacher-centered techniques favored by
208 experienced instructors have been proven substantially less efficient in transferring knowledge
209 compared to more contemporary student-centered approaches (e.g., Prince 2004; Cornelius-
210 White 2007; Wright and Weimer 2011).

211 The variability in priorities amongst universities can also play a major role in course content and
212 methods used in presenting such content. These priorities are often apparent at the level of the
213 individual professor within a university, i.e., emphasis on instruction or research. Professors with

214 high emphasis on teaching tend to adopt new pedagogies and expand the content of their courses
215 more readily than those with more research-focused obligations. From the perspective of the
216 researchers, why invest time and effort into improving a course when the time could better be
217 spent on research, which will have the benefit of improving their professional standing and
218 career advancement. The inverse here, of course, applies to those with high teaching emphasis.

219 **Hindering Factors: What Hinders Developing and Utilizing Innovative Educational** 220 **Resources?**

221 Interviews with academia members showed that there are many challenges when it comes to
222 sustainable development and utilization of innovative materials. These issues have been
223 summarized into five categories: time limitations, steep learning curves, refurbishing
224 requirements, rigidity of material, and lack of assessment data. Out of these five categories, the
225 first two were cited by nearly all of the interviewees. The importance and relevance of each of
226 these challenges are discussed in the following sections. It should be noted that these challenges
227 are not additive, rather they are highly interactive; i.e., a solution to one may provide a means for
228 overcoming another or, conversely, have an adverse effect on the other.

229 *Time Limitations*

230 Time requirement was by far the most cited hindering factor by nearly all of the interviewees.
231 While instructors see the need for restructuring of the current curriculum, they are either too busy
232 or are not knowledgeable enough to develop new material that addresses emerging resources
233 such as modeling and data analysis techniques. As one of the interviewees stated: “In
234 undergraduate courses, I introduce some modeling software, but only at the level of presentation
235 with no actual use, mainly due to lack of time, but could also be due to lack of material that is

ready to use especially in areas out of my immediate specialty.” Developing innovative resources is difficult because it requires knowledge in both the subject matter and on educational research. Finding effective pedagogies (e.g., active-learning strategies, problem-based learning) and then structuring material in a way that is presentable to students can be challenging and time-consuming. Most interviewees indicated that they look for peer-developed material. While this solves the pain of developing one’s own material, many of the other pains persist and some are magnified. For instance, using peer-developed material that utilizes an unfamiliar software, project, or dataset, may present a learning curve for the professor who is implementing it. Aside from development time, there is also a time requirement for preparation and implementation. One instructor stated that “dynamic lecture material (e.g., case studies with continuously changing datasets) takes too much time and effort to prepare and maintain.” It was also the opinion of many interviewees that new, innovative resources should not replace existing material; rather, they should augment it, simply due to the mostly supplementary nature of these new resources. It is easy to see how this translates to more lesson preparation time, strain on class time with an already over-loaded curriculum, more out-of-class time with students (e.g., office hours, email communication), and evaluation and assessment time.

Steep Learning Curves

This was another factor that was cited by a majority of the interviewees who expressed that a large issue for them is the steep learning curve involved when using new, unfamiliar tools and techniques that are part of an innovative resource. For example, one of the interviewees stated that “Pre-customized case studies are useful but professors have to get familiar with these specific cases, which could be a burden to learn and spend time before they assign it to students.” Interviewees also indicated that incorporating these advancements in the classroom is

259 problematic for students as well, due to the difficulty in learning to use new tools or software,
260 which might generate student resistance to the new resources. Students must be trained to use a
261 computational model, a GIS tool, or other software before they can apply it in a useful way. This
262 issue was clearly stated by one of the interviewees: “Solution is to build guidance and support
263 mechanisms to students to reduce the learning curve – no matter which different material we
264 choose to use, we need to make sure that we reduce the learning curve for students.” The
265 interplay between students’ resistance to new materials and faculty’s decisions to adopt these
266 materials was also iterated by one of the interviewees: “Adopting digital resources for learning is
267 much needed by the community, but this depends on the level of students and how they are
268 prepared to engage in modelling and data-based analysis; so could be appreciated by the
269 professor, but the challenge is the level of students.” Effectively using computational tools and
270 models is not straightforward and is considered an art by the community because of the
271 experience required to use the tool appropriately. Many of these tools are rather crude and are far
272 from intuitive, and even those with friendly graphical user interfaces are still ages behind the
273 easy-to-use mainstream software that students are accustomed to (e.g., online maps, spreadsheet
274 and word processing software). While huge strides have been made in making such tools more
275 user friendly, models need to be properly introduced to students to better understand their
276 applicability and limitations and avoid serious misuse or faulty interpretation of results. The
277 interviews also indicated that the steep learning curves are not only associated with software use,
278 but also with the use of case-studies and real-world projects situated in specific regional basins
279 that may not be familiar to the instructors. One instructor stated that: “I use a textbook that has
280 lots of data applications, but these are mostly based in one state, which could be an obstacle.”
281 Despite their educational value, region-specific case studies often require the instructors to learn

about the particular basin and the hydrologic problems that pertain to that basin, which might render these peer-authored resources less practical to adopt. This perhaps suggests that effective peer-authored resources should provide adequate context and user-support in order for them to be used effectively and to alleviate the learning curve of interested adopters.

Updating and Refurbishing

Another issue cited by the interviewers deals with the rate at which data and modeling tools become obsolete (e.g., data web links, software versions). Frustration with the high turnover of new materials can be a deterring factor for adoption since “technology glitches can take up class time” as stated by one of the interviewees. Changes to website interfaces and online data portals of major agencies that provide water resources datasets can cause rapid turnover of educational developments. To sustain this pace, data and modeling-based educational resources must be updated frequently in course material, which requires time and effort from the instructors. Compared to textbooks which receive updates (often just moderately modified forms of the previous versions) only every three to five years, materials that are dependent on dynamic resources require continuous adaptation. Additionally, updating of the materials is needed after feedback is received from students or other users. These usually take the form of assessment data on students’ experiences with using the materials, impact on students’ learning, and expansion or inclusion of supporting resources and improvement to the design of the new resource. Therefore, the ability to easily and quickly update materials is a critical feature that must be available to effectively sustain and scale new educational materials that emphasize the use of technology and research advancements.

303 *Lack of Modularity and Customizability*

304 The interview responses indicated that most instructors, especially those who are senior or those
305 who are not able to commit significant instructional time, have well-developed courses and are
306 simply looking for material that reinforces or supports their current curriculum. For their
307 purpose, the interviewees indicated that resources should be very modular. As one interviewee
308 said, “I need resources that are not ‘too rigid’, that are ‘loose’ in format and content; I am
309 looking for ‘a la carte’ items, and not the ‘whole menu’.” In contrast, most of the interviewees
310 from the early-career segment expressed an interest in material to build their class around and
311 therefore were looking for larger, more holistic resources that can still be customized to their
312 specific needs (e.g., different datasets, or hydrologic basins).

313 The interviews revealed that material that is not tailored to the specific need of the implementing
314 professor (in content or format) presents additional challenges for development and adoption.
315 For example, will the material be presented during the lecture portion of the class, during
316 laboratory time, as a homework assignment, or as a class project? Each option has its own
317 benefits and challenges; for instance, including new material in the class or in the lab may prove
318 difficult given time constraints and pre-existing course material. However, it may allow the
319 instructor to directly interact with students and to readily provide expert guidance. This, of
320 course, is made more difficult if assigned as an out-of-class assignment. In such cases, it is
321 important for the developer to provide additional user support, specific to the needs of the local
322 students to supplement the absence of the instructor (e.g., detailed instructions, screenshots,
323 videos, templates). Conversely, providing too much support can result in adverse learning
324 effects, where students follow steps blindly and without thinking about what they are trying to
325 accomplish. The ability to modify (add or subtract) material easily is a desirable trait that was

expressed by a considerable proportion of the sampled population of interviewees. This can allow instructors to use only a subsection of an existing resource and easily apply it to their needs e.g., changing the region of a case study, removing a section that is outside of the scope of the current class, or adding or removing user support.

Lack of Assessment Data and Tools

The need for both assessment tools (e.g., grading rubrics), as well as evaluation data on the potential value of the new material from a student learning perspective, were cited by some of the interviewees. Instructors often look for evidence (e.g., documented evaluation results on student performance) that the material is effective before implementing it in their class. This becomes a bit of a conundrum especially for pilot efforts which have yet to be tested. Typically, developers attain initial assessment data from their own institution; however, this is usually a rather limited sample size and results of the developer-implementation generally contain some level of bias. Furthermore, the interviewees highlighted another aspect related to the difficulty associated with grading students' work, especially when non-traditional material is being introduced, such as data and modeling techniques. As one of the interviewees stated, "I think the software itself can be useful but as it currently stands, if a student does the exercise, I have no easy way to grade the student."

Views from Industry

A total of 36 practicing engineers were interviewed. Below is a summary of the results of these interviews with recurring topics of discussion on the level of preparedness of recent graduates and how post-graduation training relates to and builds on education at the undergraduate level.

Preparedness of Recent Graduates

Nearly all of the sampled population of senior engineers and managers indicated that young engineers specializing in hydrology and water resources must be able to utilize, understand, and develop models; interpret and analyze results; effectively identify and communicate key findings; and, more importantly, have fundamental knowledge on the theory underlying the model. Understanding when and where assumptions and approximations should be made, and being able to identify sources of uncertainties and articulate limitations of a modeling analysis, are important skills for young engineers, but are not consistently attained by new graduates, as many of the senior interviewees suggested. General knowledge of numerical modeling concepts was cited as a more desirable attribute than detailed training in a specific software. Priority was given to the former due to the large variation of tools and models used among consulting firms. In addition to modeling and data analysis skills, the majority of industry professionals stated that recent graduates typically have underdeveloped engineering soft skills, such as communication, creativity, adaptability, and collaboration. This was also iterated in interviews with engineers from government agencies. While the interviewees acknowledged that such skills are usually hard to teach in traditional classrooms, they expressed that the use of case-based, data and modeling-driven student projects, developed through collaboration with industry, present some unique opportunities to introduce these types of skills into the undergraduate curriculum.

Most of the young engineers who were interviewed were very eager to share their perspectives of undergraduate curriculum. While most of them felt that their undergraduate degree adequately prepared them for their first job, they stated that their knowledge of the use of computer models and related tools was lacking. They were quick to clarify, however, that it was not lack of conceptual or fundamental knowledge, but simply the lack of applicability within real-world

hydrologic problems. Building on this, the interviewees complained that textbook problems often focus on using idealized and fairly narrow examples and lack the overall context of how hydrologic analysis can be pursued using data analytics and modeling approaches. This resonates with the comments presented earlier from the senior engineers on the skills needed by young engineers to be able to interpret results in the scope of the project at hand, as opposed to simply performing the analysis.

Post-graduation Training and Professional Development

Developing the skills associated with discipline-specific tools and techniques, engineering soft skills, and the ability to formulate solutions based upon contextual information, is a long-term process that does not end at the undergraduate level, but progresses slowly over several years of post-graduation training. Interviews with industry members were also intended to identify attributes of on-the-job training practices that might be leveraged and built upon in teaching these skills at the undergraduate level. Interviews with senior engineers and training managers indicated that training is obtained in the majority of consulting firms through informal techniques that utilize a mentor/apprentice approach, whereby a junior engineer works closely under a senior engineer until skills have been sufficiently mastered. This ‘learn on the job’ training with expert guidance is considered by many firms to be the most effective method of training, even compared to more formalized training courses. In addition to being effective for developing a collaborative relationship between the mentor and young engineer, it is also considered efficient from a billable hour stand point; however, the tradeoff here is the extra burden that it puts on the senior engineer.

A second approach that was cited by only a few interviewees involves use of previous projects. If a current project is to an extent similar to a past project, many firms will use this archived

project to demonstrate the design process. The junior engineer can then use this past project as a sort of template or guide for designing the current project. Investing time to develop training materials from past projects would reduce the time requirement of senior engineers in the future while still providing junior engineers with expert advice embedded into stand-alone training resources. Interviewees from small firms found this investment infeasible since they do not hire engineers at a rate that would have a timely payoff and the evolution of the tools and techniques of the industry is such that the developed material would be obsolete within a short span of time. This is in many aspects analogous to challenges with developing educational innovations. While this approach does not seem a viable option for small firms, the interviews revealed that there is already evidence of this practice in larger engineering firms. Larger firms apparently have the need (large hiring rate) to justify development of such material and the resources in terms of time and manpower to maintain them. Many firms, however, proceed with caution when this training method is used because past projects often have assumptions or design criteria that may not be always applicable to a future project. Other training opportunities (e.g., online courses, participation in workshops, hiring a consultant to provide in-house training) were mentioned by several of the interviewees, but these were not frequently used due to cost factors.

Summary, Concluding Remarks, and Recommendations

Keeping pace with evidence-based instructional practices has been a challenge confronting STEM education. However, with today's technology-savvy students, and with the recent educational research on effective pedagogies, impactful solutions are beginning to emerge. In many STEM disciplines this is evident with packaging of multimedia content with traditional textbooks, the development of web-based and interactive material by publishing companies, and non-profit educational organizations that provide open-source educational content. In the field of

416 water resources engineering education, recent efforts have focused on aspects such as the use of
417 effective discipline-specific pedagogies (e.g., case-based and active learning approaches),
418 incorporation of research and industry-standard tools and techniques through utilizing data and
419 model-driven experiences, and collaborative efforts to develop a more unified curriculum. While
420 such solutions are promising, resistance to adoption and implementation is still observed, which
421 will eventually undermine the long-term sustainability of proposed educational innovations. To
422 gain further insights into this critical problem, the current study engaged in an interview-based
423 process through talking to potential customer segments (e.g., end-users and decision makers).
424 The focus was on identifying key roadblocks and possible remedies that affect the successful
425 development, adoption, and scaling of emerging innovations, such as faculty motivators and
426 hindering factors, potential partnerships, industry perspectives on preparedness of recent
427 graduates, and potential supporting resources.

428 The qualitative interviews of this study indicated that there is a lack of tangible motivators in
429 place for faculty to engage in educational innovations. The way in which the universities
430 evaluate professors, with different distributions of focus being allocated to effective instruction
431 versus research productivity (Wagener et al. 2007), seems to play an important role in whether
432 professors are willing to adopt new pedagogies. This suggests that achieving the desirable
433 educational reforms in this field will largely remain in the hands of faculty members who are
434 personally and professionally motivated to pursue such efforts. This was iterated by the
435 interviewees who stated that self-esteem, self-efficacy, and desire for achievements in their
436 careers as educators are the primary motivation for developing or considering the adoption of
437 educational innovations. The results are in line with previous research on how instructors'
438 decisions to engage in effective implementation of research-based instructional practices relies

heavily on their instructional and personal preferences (Henderson et al. 2012). These results also highlight the importance of faculty development efforts in promoting sound pedagogical practices and learning theories in order to support effective adoption of innovations, as was recently suggested by Shekhar and Borrego (2016).

Results from interviews with hydrology and water resources engineering faculty members identified key hindering factors for developing and adopting educational innovations in the field (Table 1), including: time limitations, steep learning curves, continuous refurbishment, rigidity of material, locality of case studies to specific hydrologic basins and datasets, and lack of assessment tools and evaluation data. The first two of these factors were cited by a large majority of the interviewees. While the assessment data and tools factor was mentioned by only a few of the interviewees, its importance is evident in the existing literature. Assessment of innovative educational developments is an invaluable aspect of implementation and is critical to the successful scaling and adopting of innovations. These findings point out the importance of crucial, yet often-missing elements of user-support mechanisms to instructors who have the intention to adopt innovations. The expressed need for instructor support, both as built-in features of the innovation (e.g., rubrics, assessment methods) and as post-development support (e.g., follow-up support to resolve problems), agrees with the recently proposed model on design for sustained adoption (Henderson et al., 2015).

Results from interviews with practicing engineers in both private and public sectors revealed some critical information on the need for innovative resources that introduce data and modeling-based skills. Interviews with senior industry members indicated that young engineers have problems formulating solution procedures from context, lack familiarity with real-world hydrologic data, and have deficient knowledge of emerging analytic tools and modeling

techniques that are increasingly used by industry to solve water resources problems. Young engineers acknowledged deficiencies in the use of computer models and their applicability within real-world hydrologic problems. While the interviewees did not reveal a specific reason for this problem, it is reasonable to attribute it to the lack of context and open-ended problems in traditional textbook problems.

Based on the views and insights gathered during this study, the following strategies for design and dissemination of new water resources engineering educational innovations are recommended (Table 1). To enhance the potential for broader adoption and scaling, educational material should be easily adaptable and flexible in nature, have mild learning curves (for instructors and students), and have a modular design to easily fit into current course curriculum that may already be crowded with existing content. Additionally, material should be consistently maintained and improved to keep up with the upgrading of models, data, and other technologies. Incompatibility of the structure, format, or content of educational innovations with existing work flow of the class requires extensive time and effort to overcome and often results in non-adoption. It is also critical that new material should be accompanied by a rigorous set of assessment resources (e.g., solution keys, rubrics) to encourage and support potential faculty adopters. The development of new educational materials without direct input from potential users often results in incompatibility problems and lack of user-supporting tools. An innovation development approach that is based on continuous and iterative feedback from potential faculty users holds a great potential for successful adoption (Khatri et al. 2016). Similarly, collaborative efforts and sharing of innovations and learning resources among universities can potentially result in the development of assessment data that encourage independent adoption as well as distributing the time and effort of development and upkeep. Furthermore, co-developed material that is well

485 balanced between research specialties of the collaborators may present unprecedented
486 opportunities for student learning. The need for long-term, post-development maintenance and
487 user-support is undoubtedly challenged by lack of continuous streams of financial resources. The
488 typical sources of funding that support educational innovations come from federal and state
489 grants, which are by nature time-limited. This calls on the water resources educational
490 community to look for non-conventional funding mechanisms. Avenues to explore include
491 digital publishing of case-studies and associated datasets and models, possibly as supplements to
492 textbooks or as standalone web resources. These opportunities are increasingly sought by other
493 science and engineering fields and could potentially offer solutions for sustaining and growing
494 the desired resources.

495 Talking with practicing professionals revealed many untapped resources which may be utilized
496 by water resources engineering faculty through collaborations with industry practitioners. By
497 contributing educationally-rich resources such as case studies, datasets, and existing models,
498 industry can support instructors by easing the time and effort associated with developing
499 educational innovations, and simultaneously contribute to molding the water resources
500 engineering educational curriculum by introducing industry-relevant skills and expectations.
501 Interestingly, there exist many similarities between developing and implementing educational
502 innovations and professional training practices, e.g., refurbishing requirements of formal training
503 resources and educational innovations; criteria for choosing training material and criteria for
504 implementing educational innovations (time and convenience); and the use of web-based training
505 courses and web-based technologies for university educational innovations. Despite constraints
506 that might exist at the industry side (e.g., client confidentiality), studying these similarities can
507 help identify parallel interests and challenges and inform efforts for investing in mutually

beneficial academia-industry collaborations. Models of such collaborations exist in capstone classes, internships, and co-ops, and can be extended to other classes where data and modeling resources, for example, may be co-developed and used both by students and by junior engineers for early training purposes.

This research employed a qualitative approach using a sample of open-ended interviews with educators and professionals from different institution types and geographical distributions. The results can be further substantiated by adopting a mixed methods design (Creswell et al. 2003) where both qualitative and quantitative data are collected and analyzed according to the specific archetypes of the interviewees.

Acknowledgement

This study was supported by the National Science Foundation under awards number 1644493 and 1726965. The authors thank the Innovation Corps for Learning (I-Corps-L) instruction team for their guidance on the interviews and interpretation of results. The assistance of Henry Chu from the University of Louisiana at Lafayette is acknowledged. The authors gratefully acknowledge the voluntarily participation by interviewees from both academia and industry.

Author Bio and Contact Information

Emad Habib is a University Distinguished Professor in the Civil Engineering Department at the University of Louisiana at Lafayette. His research expertise is in precipitation estimation and analysis, hydrologic modeling, flood prediction and water resource management, coastal restoration, and hydrology education innovations. He published more than 60 peer-reviewed journal articles, five book chapters, and several conference papers. He served on the Precipitation Committee of the American Geophysical Union (AGU), and currently serves on the Education

530 Committee of the Consortium of Universities for Advancement of Hydrologic Sciences Inc.
531 (CUAHSI). He is a Professional Engineer registered in the states of Louisiana and Texas. He can
532 be reached at: PO Box 42291, Lafayette, LA, USA, Phone: 337-482-6513
533 (habib@louisiana.edu).

534 **Matthew Deshotel** is a Master of Science Graduate Research Assistant in the Civil Engineering
535 Department at the University of Louisiana at Lafayette. His research interests are in engineering
536 education innovations, coastal restoration, and numerical modeling. He can be contacted at
537 mdeshot@gmail.com. He is currently a Water Resources Engineer with Dewberry.

538 **References**

539 AghaKouchak, A., N. Nakhjiri, and E. Habib. 2013. An educational model for ensemble
540 streamflow simulation and uncertainty analysis. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*
541 17(2): 445-452. doi:10.5194/hess-17-445-2013. Accessed July 11, 2018.

542 Ajzen, I. 2011. Theory of Planned Behavior: A Bibliography. Available at:
543 <http://people.umass.edu/ajzen/tpbrefs.html>. Accessed July 11, 2018.

544 Blank, S. and B. Dorf. 2012. *The Startup Owner's Manual*. K&S Ranch, Pescadero, CA.

545 Borrego, M., J.E. Froyd, and T. Hall. 2010. Diffusion of engineering education innovations: A
546 survey of awareness and adoption rates in U.S. engineering departments. *Journal of*
547 *Engineering Education* 99(3): 185-207.

548 Bourrie, D.M., C.G. Cegielski, L.A. Jones-Farmer, and C.S. Sankar. 2014. Identifying
549 characteristics of dissemination success using an expert panel. *Decision Sciences Journal*
550 *of Innovative Education* 12(4): 357-380.

551 Brogan, D.S., W.M. McDonald, V.K. Lohani, R.L. Dymond, and A.J. Bradner. 2016.
 552 Development and classroom implementation of an environmental data creation and
 553 sharing tool. *Advances in Engineering Education* 5(2): 1-34.

554 Chavela Guerra, R.C., K.A. Smith, A.F. McKenna, C. Swan, R. Korte, S. Jordan, M. Lande, and
 555 R. MacNeal. 2014. Innovation Corps for Learning: Evidence-based Entrepreneurship™
 556 to Improve (STEM) Education. *ASEE/IEEE Frontiers in Education Conference*.

557 Compeau, D.R., D.B. Meister, and C.A. Higgins. 2007. From prediction to explanation:
 558 Reconceptualizing and extending the perceived characteristics of innovating. *Journal of*
 559 *the Association for Information Systems* 8(8): 409-439.

560 Cornelius-White, J. 2007. Learner-Centered Teacher-Student Relationships Are Effective: A
 561 Meta-Analysis. *Review of Educational Research* 77(1), 113-143.

562 Creswell, J.W., V.L. Plano Clark, M.L. Gutmann, and W. E. Hanson. 2003. Advanced mixed
 563 methods research designs. In *Handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioral*
 564 *research*, eds. A. Tashakkori and C. Teddlie, 209–240. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
 565 Publications.

566 Cutler, S., M. Borrego, C. Henderson, M. Prince, and J. Froyd. 2012. A comparison of electrical,
 567 computer, and chemical engineering faculty's progression through the innovation-
 568 decision process. In: *Proceedings - Frontiers in Education Conference*. Seattle, WA. pp.
 569 1-5.

570 DiNatale, K. 2008. Needs of the Consulting Engineering Sector and Strengths and Weaknesses
 571 of Today's Graduates. *Journal of Contemporary Water Research & Education* 139: 14–
 572 16. doi:10.1111/j.1936-704X.2008.00013.x

573 Eisel, L. M. 2008. Entry Level Needs of the Engineering and Water Resources Planning Sector.
574 *Journal of Contemporary Water Research & Education* 139: 12–13. doi:10.1111/j.1936-
575 704X.2008.00012.x

576 Finelli, C.J., M. DeMonbrun, M. Borrego, P. Shekhar, C. Henderson, M.J. Prince, and C.K.
577 Waters. 2014. A classroom observation instrument for assessing student reaction to active
578 learning. In: *IEEE Frontiers in Education Annual Conference, Proceedings*. IEEE,
579 Madrid, Spain. doi:10.1109/FIE.2014.7044084. Accessed July 11, 2018.

580 Froyd, J., M. Borrego, S. Cutler, M. Prince, and C. Henderson. 2013. Estimates of use of
581 research-based instructional strategies in core electrical or computer engineering
582 courses. *IEEE Transactions on Education* 56(4): 393-399.

583 Habib, E., Y. Ma, D. Williams, H.O. Sharif, and F. Hossain. 2012a. HydroViz: Design and
584 evaluation of a web-based tool for improving hydrology education. *Hydrology and Earth*
585 *System Sciences* 16(10): 3767-3781. doi:10.5194/hess-16-3767-2012. Accessed July 11,
586 2018.

587 Habib, E., Y. Ma, and D. Williams. 2012b. Development of a web-based hydrologic education
588 tool using Google Earth resources. In: *Google Earth and Virtual Visualizations in*
589 *Geoscience Education and Research*, S.J. Whitmeyer, J.E. Bailey, D.G. De Paor, and T.
590 Ornduff (Eds.). GSA Special Papers Vol. 492. Geological Society of America, pp. 431-
591 439. doi:10.1130/2012.2492(33). Accessed July 11, 2018.

592 Hardgrave, B.C., F.D. Davis, and C.K. Riemenschneider. 2003. Investigating determinants of
593 software developers' intentions to follow methodologies. *Journal of Management*
594 *Information Systems* 20(1):123-151.

595 Henderson, C., M.H. Dancy, and M. Niewiadomska-Bugaj. 2012. Use of research-based
 596 instructional strategies in introductory physics: Where do faculty leave the innovation-
 597 decision process? *Physical Review Special Topics - Physics Education Research* 8(2):
 598 020104. doi:10.1103/PhysRevSTPER.8.020104. Accessed July 11, 2018.

599 Henderson, C., R. Cole, J. Froyd, D. Friedrichsen, R. Khatri, and C. Stanford. 2015. *Designing*
 600 *Educational Innovations for Sustained Adoption: A How-to Guide for Education*
 601 *Developers Who Want to Increase the Impact of Their Work*. Increase the Impact,
 602 Kalamazoo, MI.

603 Heywood, J. 2006. Factors in the adoption of change: Identity, plausibility and power in
 604 promoting educational change. *36th Annual IEEE Frontiers in Education*. San Diego,
 605 CA, pp. 9-14. doi:10.1109/FIE.2006.322299. Accessed July 11, 2018.

606 Hoekstra, A.Y. 2012. Computer-supported games and role plays in teaching water management.
 607 *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences* 16(8): 2985-2994. doi:10.5194/hess-16-2985-
 608 2012. Accessed July 11, 2018.

609 Janus, K. 2018. *Social Startup Success: How the Best Nonprofits Launch, Scale Up and Make a*
 610 *Difference*. DeCapo Lifelong Books, New York, NY.

611 Khatri, R., C. Henderson, R. Cole, J.E. Froyd, D. Friedrichsen, and C. Stanford. 2016.
 612 Designing for sustained adoption: A model of developing educational innovations for
 613 successful propagation. *Physical Review Physics Education Research* 12(1): 010112.
 614 Available at:
 615 <https://journals.aps.org/prper/abstract/10.1103/PhysRevPhysEducRes.12.010112>.
 616 Accessed July 11, 2018.

617 Lattuca, L.R. and J.S. Stark. 1995. Modifying the major: Discretionary thoughts from 10
618 disciplines. *The Review of Higher Education* 18(3): 315-344.

619 McDonald, W.M., D.S. Brogan, V.K. Lohani, R.L. Dymond, and R.L. Clark. 2015. Integrating a
620 real-time environmental monitoring lab into university and community college courses.
621 *International Journal of Engineering Education* 31(4): 1139-1157.

622 McIntosh, B. S. and A. Taylor. 2013. Developing T-Shaped Water Professionals: Building
623 Capacity in Collaboration, Learning, and Leadership to Drive Innovation. *Journal of*
624 *Contemporary Water Research & Education* 150: 6–17. doi:10.1111/j.1936-
625 704X.2013.03143.x

626 McKenna, A.F., J. Froyd, C.J. King, T. Litzinger, and E. Seymour. 2011. *The Complexities of*
627 *Transforming Engineering Higher Education: Report on Forum on Characterizing the*
628 *Impact and Diffusion of Transformative Engineering Education Innovations*. National
629 Academy of Engineering, Washington, D.C.

630 Merwade, V. and B.L. Ruddell. 2012. Moving university hydrology education forward with
631 community-based geoinformatics, data and modeling resources. *Hydrology and Earth*
632 *System Sciences* 16: 2393-2404.

633 Osterwalder, A. and Y. Pigneur. 2010. *Business Model Generation: A Handbook for Visionaries,*
634 *Game Changers, and Challengers*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, NY.

635 Patton, M.Q. 1990. *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods*, 2nd Ed. Sage, Newbury Park,
636 CA. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1002/nur.4770140111>. Accessed July 11, 2018.

637 Prince, M. (2004). Does active learning work? A review of the research. *Journal of Engineering*
638 *Education*. 93, pp. 223–231.

639 Prince, M., M. Borrego, C. Henderson, S. Cutler, and J. Froyd. 2013. Use of research-based
640 instructional strategies in core chemical engineering courses. *Chemical Engineering*
641 *Education* 47(1): 27-37.

642 Rogers, E. 2003. *Diffusion of Innovations*. 5th Ed. Free Press, New York, NY.

643 Ruddell, B.L. and T. Wagener. 2014. Grand challenges for hydrology education in the 21st
644 Century. *Journal of Hydrologic Engineering* 20(1). doi:10.1061/(ASCE)HE.1943-
645 5584.0000956. Accessed July 11, 2018.

646 Rusca, M., J. Heun, and K. Schwartz. 2012. Water management simulation games and the
647 construction of knowledge. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences* 16(8): 2749-2757.
648 doi:10.5194/hess-16-2749-2012. Accessed July 11, 2018.

649 Sanchez, C. A., B.L. Ruddell, R. Schiesser and V. Merwade. 2016. Enhancing the T-shaped
650 learning profile when teaching hydrology using data, modeling, and visualization
651 activities. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences* 20(3):1289-1299 doi:10.5194/hess-20-
652 1289-2016.

653 Shekhar, P. and M. Borrego. 2016. After the workshop: A case study of post-workshop
654 implementation of active learning in an electrical engineering course. *IEEE Transactions*
655 *on Education* 60(1): 1-7.

656 Seibert, J. and M.J.P. Vis. 2012. Teaching hydrological modeling with a user-friendly
657 catchment-runoff-model software package. *Hydrology and Earth Sytem Sciences* 16(9):
658 3315-3325. doi:10.5194/hess-16-3315-2012. Accessed July 11, 2018.

659 Seibert, J., S. Uhlenbrook and T. Wagener. 2013. Preface Hydrology education in a changing
660 world. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences* 17 (4): 1393-1399. doi:10.5194/hess-17-
661 1393-2013. Accessed July 11, 2018.

662 Singer, S.R., N.R. Nielsen, and H.A. Schweingruber. 2012. *Discipline-Based Education*
663 *Research: Understanding and Improving Learning in Undergraduate Science and*
664 *Engineering*. National Academies Press, Washington, D.C.

665 Smith, K.A., R.C. Chavela Guerra, A.F. Mckenna, C. Swan, and R. Korte. 2016. Innovation
666 Corps for Learning (I-Corps L): Assessing the potential for sustainable scalability of
667 educational innovations. In: *2016 ASEE Annual Conference and Exposition*. American
668 Society of Engineering Education. Available at:
669 [https://www.scopus.com/record/display.uri?eid=2-s2.0-](https://www.scopus.com/record/display.uri?eid=2-s2.0-84983261274&origin=inward&txGid=ed55fbd2138ceb3ceeeedc9b6e1bb0d)
670 [84983261274&origin=inward&txGid=ed55fbd2138ceb3ceeeedc9b6e1bb0d](https://www.scopus.com/record/display.uri?eid=2-s2.0-84983261274&origin=inward&txGid=ed55fbd2138ceb3ceeeedc9b6e1bb0d). Accessed
671 July 11, 2018.

672 Wagener, T., M. Weiler, B. McGlynn, L. Marshall, M. McHale, T. Meixner, and K. McGuire.
673 2007. Taking the pulse of hydrology education. *Hydrological Processes*, 21, 1789-1792

674 Wagener, T. and S. Zappe. 2008. Introducing real-world hydrology case studies into an
675 undergraduate civil and environmental engineering curriculum. *ASEE Annual Conference*
676 *& Exposition Proceedings*. American Society of Engineering Education (ASEE),
677 Pittsburgh, PA, USA, pp. 1-11.

678 Wagener, T., C. Kelleher, M. Weiler, B. McGlynn, M. Gooseff, L. Marshall, T. Meixner, et al.
679 2012. It takes a community to raise a hydrologist: The Modular Curriculum for
680 Hydrologic Advancement (MOCHA). *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*.
681 doi:10.5194/hess-16-3405-2012. Accessed July 11, 2018.

682 Wankat, P.C., R.M. Felder, K.A. Smith, and F.S. Oreovicz. 2002. The scholarship of teaching
683 and learning in engineering. In: *Disciplinary Styles in the Scholarship of Teaching and*
684 *Learning: Exploring Common Ground*, M.T. Huber and S.P. Morreale (Eds.). Stylus
685 Publishing, Sterling, VA, pp. 217-237.

686 Wright, G. B., and M. Weimer. 2011. Student-Centered Learning in Higher Education.
687 *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education* 23, 92-97.

688 Yigzaw, W., F. Hossain, and E. Habib. 2013. A Google-Earth based education tool for place-
689 based learning of hydrologic concepts using a campus watershed and Wi-Fi connectivity.
690 *Computers in Education Journal* 23(4).

691

692

693

694 **Table 1.** Barriers and proposed solutions to increase adoption of educational innovations in
695 hydrology and water resources engineering

Barriers to Adoption and Scaling	Recommended Solutions and Possible Opportunities
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steep learning curves for instructors • Time requirements for development and implementation • Specificity of case studies to local basins • Rigidity of material 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaborative development and sharing • Modular design and customizability • Web-based developments to facilitate dissemination and adoption • Iterative and post-development faculty-support mechanisms

-
- | | |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Lack of assessment data• Lack of assessment tools• Curriculum constraints• Lack of financial resources to sustain development• Refurbishing requirements | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Assessment tools provided as part of the developments• Partnerships with water resources engineering industry• Educational initiatives at water resources engineering professional societies• Digital publishing |
|--|---|
-

696

697